

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9
10

11
12 MEDIATEK, INC.,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 FREESCALE SEMICONDUCTOR, INC.,

16 Defendant.
17

Case No. 11-5341 YGR (JSC)

**ORDER RE: FREESCALE'S
DISCOVERY LETTER BRIEFS (Dkt.
Nos. 190, 191, 192, 193, & 194)**

18
19 Now pending before the Court are five new discovery disputes filed by Defendant,
20 Freescale Semiconductor, Inc. ("Freescale") on August 23, 2013. (Dkt. Nos. 190-3, 191-3,
21 192-3, 193-3, & 194-3.) Also, pending are the previously filed ten discovery disputes filed by
22 Plaintiff MediaTek Inc. ("MediaTek") and the parties' motions to amend their respective
23 infringement/invalidity contentions which are set for hearing this Thursday, August 29, 2013.

24 On July 23, 2013, the District Court granted Freescale leave to file discovery motions
25 regarding the depositions of Messrs. Shieh, Sorensen, Tsou, and Yang until August 23, 2013;
26 however, although the parties are aware of the requirements of this Court's Standing Order
27 that the parties meet and confer and file discovery disputes as *joint* letter briefs (Dkt. Nos.
28 190, 191, 192, 193, & 194), Freescale's submissions are not joint letter briefs. Freescale's
submissions do not even acknowledge that its letters are not joint letters or make any attempt

1 to justify non-compliance with the Court's Standing Order. Freescale's failure is all the more
2 puzzling given that it evidently met and conferred with MediaTek to draft the "joint
3 stipulation" to file the discovery disputes under seal as it is signed by both parties, and
4 although Freescale states that the parties met and conferred regarding each dispute, part of
5 that meet and confer involves drafting the joint letter brief.

6 Accordingly, Freescale's discovery letter briefs (Dkt. Nos. 190-3, 191-3, 192-3, 193-3,
7 & 194-3) are DENIED for failing to comply with this Court's Standing Order or establish
8 good cause for such non-compliance. The accompanying administrative motions to seal (Dkt.
9 Nos. 190, 191, 192, 193, & 194) are similarly DENIED as they fail to comply with this
10 Court's Standing Order or the Local Rules (*see* Dkt. No. 177 (requests for sealing must be
11 "narrowly tailored" and parties may not stipulate to file things under seal)).

12
13 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

14
15 Dated: August 26, 2013

16 
17 JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY
18 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28